

REMARKS

The final Office Action dated April 30, 2009, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 10-18, 20-23, 30-35 and 57 are currently pending under examination, and Claims 1-9, 24-29 and 36-56 are withdrawn. By this Amendment, Claim 57 has been added. Support for the amendment may be found in the specification at, for example, paragraph [0055]. The Applicants submit that no new matter is added. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 10-18, 20-23 and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amini et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,698,021, hereinafter "Amini") in view of Maeno (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,644, hereinafter "Maeno"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows.

Amini and Maeno, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for performing remote video audits, the method including at least the following combination of features "creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items; selecting at least one of the plurality of audit items; obtaining video information regarding the selected audit item, wherein the video information includes video stills; entering a classification for the selected audit item based on reviewing the video information; storing the selected audit item after the classification is entered; and calculating a compliance percentage in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit items," as recited in claim 10.

The Office Action, on page 2, asserts Amini discloses “creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items (Amini: column 14, lines 5-17).” Amini, in col. 13, line 59-col. 14, line 17, discloses “retrieving archived video images” comprising “two general steps, the selection of a particular camera 312 and the selection of a period of time of interest.” In addition, Amini discloses, in col. 13, lines 65-67, “the user can navigate through varying levels in a hyperlinked hierarchy that describes a particular client’s network of cameras.”

However, “retrieving archived video images” does not disclose or suggest “creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items,” as recited in claim 10. (Emphasis added). Further, navigating “through varying levels in a hyperlinked hierarchy that describes a particular client’s network of cameras” does not disclose or suggest “creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items,” as recited in claim 10. (Emphasis added). Therefore, Amini does not disclose or suggest “creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items,” as recited in claim 10.

In addition, the Office Action, on page 2, asserts Amini discloses “calculating a compliance percentage in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit items (Amini: column 9, lines 35-47: binary logic represents a 0% or 100% compliance percentage of stored event video).”

Amini, in col. 9, lines 35-54, discloses “an event-driven recording scheme” and “to facilitate this form of event-driven processing, the event processing selection parameter in the configuration file is set of an affirmative state (e.g., “Y”).” Setting a parameter to “an affirmative state (e.g., “Y”)” does not disclose or suggest “calculating a

compliance percentage...based on the classification of one or more such stored audit items,” as recited in claim 10. In addition, Amini, in col. 9, lines 61-64, discloses, “the detection of a change in state (e.g., low to high) of an event variable prompts camera server...to notify Image Capture Application 510 of the occurrence of the event.” (Emphasis added). However, changing a “state (e.g., low to high) of an event variable” does not disclose or suggest “calculating a compliance percentage,” as recited in claim 10. Therefore, Amini does not disclose or suggest “calculating a compliance percentage in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit items,” as recited in claim 10.

Maeno fails to disclose the above features, and therefore, fails to cure the above noted deficiencies of Amini.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicants submit claim 10 is allowable over the cited references. The Applicant submits that claims 15 and 30 are also allowable for similar reasons.

As claims 10, 15 and 30 are allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 11-14, 16-18, 20-23 and 31-35, which depend from allowable claims 10, 15 and 30, respectively, are likewise allowable over the cited references, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

New Claim 57

The Applicants have added new claim 57 to recite subject matter to which they are entitled, and submit that this claim is allowable over the cited art of record.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event that this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account Number 01-2300, referencing Docket Number 024478-00023.

Respectfully submitted,



Tiffany J. Brooks

Registration Number 57,912

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

TJB:elp